SEXUAL ORIENTATION LEGISLATION: POSITION STATEMENT

COLORADO FOR FAMILY VALUES

Preface

Recently, Colorado homosexual, lesbian and bisexual activists, and their supporters, have launched a multi-pronged legislative offensive whose goal is to secure for their "sexual orientations" the same, (plus additional) rights, protections and privileges under civil rights laws as those now enjoyed by racial, ethnic and religious groups in our state.

In other words, homosexuals, lesbians and bisexuals wish to be granted rights only historically applied by governments on the basis of the kinds of birth characteristics, like race, color, gender or national origin, which traditionally define **ethnicity**.

They also wish to be extended the same special protections accorded to people of good character who are physically handicapped, whether from birth or by unchosen accident or disease, through no deliberate fault or behavior of their own.

The issue is:

Should the State of Colorado grant practitioners of these "sexual orientations" their wish, and bestow on them fully recognized and legally sanctioned "protected class status"?

Before we address this issue directly, let us begin by stating that, to our knowledge, no individual associated with Colorado for Family values, has ever been or ever intends to be a skinhead, neo-Nazi, member of the Ku Klux Klan, Posse Comitatus, Aryan Nation or any other "fascist" fringe group. People of this sort would not be welcome as members of our organization.

In fact, the political background of Tony Marco, one of our two Co-Chairmen, (and the author of this statement) is decidedly **left-wing**. Marco has been a Marxist. He took part in the earliest Midwest civil rights demonstrations and organized the first on-campus political demonstrations there.

He has been a feminist (he and an earlier "significant other" associated and workshopped with the "godmothers" of the modern feminist movement, including the Redstockings, Anne Koedt, Kate Millet, Shulamith Firestone).

We do not all claim to have been lifelong practitioners of sexual abstinence. Some of us know what it is like to have wrestled with fantasies left over from sexually-promiscuous lives.

Some of us have had close personal contact with homosexual men and lesbian women and at some time approved of their behavior. In fact, a close homosexual friend of Tony Marco spent time in Marco's apartment with the man credited with starting the 1969 Stonewall Bar riot -- and therefore the so-called "Gay Rights Movement" -- by hurling a garbage can through a police car window. Marco's friend was this man's lover.

In other words, we understand and are committed to uphold the traditional concepts of civil rights, i.e., equal opportunity for all individuals of good behavior to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness under the laws of our state and nation. We certainly do not wish to deprive homosexuals, bisexuals or lesbians of any rights that are legitimately theirs under our Federal and State Constitutions.

But we are also well-informed about homosexual behavior and we understand the issues associated with it -- well enough to question whether perhaps it is society that needs protection from the effects of legally sanctioning such behavior.

A Deeper Purpose

And it is **because** of these understandings, Colorado for Family Values opposes legislation that would grant ethnic or protected class status to homosexual, bisexual and lesbian behavior.

And these understandings have led us to form a deeper purpose than merely seeing that "homosexual rights" do not gain the force of law in our state.

Our deeper purpose is to bring a message of hope to individuals who, because of alienation and rejection, have chosen to go down a futile road of unfulfilling sexual expression. We understand that road. Some of us have walked it. We can also attest to the reality of the hope -- because we are living proof that it's real.

This said, we'll now present the reasons why the many Colorado citizens who make up Colorado for Family Values oppose the addition of "sexual orientation" with protected class status to any of this State's civil statutes -- protection which would reward homosexuality, bisexuality and lesbianism with status, rights and privileges equal to those enjoyed by traditionally-recognized ethnic groups.

Granting Ethnic Status Based On Behavior

Let's move quickly past the surface reasons proponents give for promoting legislation giving protected class status to "sexual orientation." All civilized people abhor violence and abuse of any sort generated by bigotry and hatred.

This state's criminal laws and Ethnic Harassment Bill are now in force to administer appropriate punishment for assault and other violent crimes, as well as for various forms of abuse and intimidation against true ethnic groups.

But we'd like to make one point clear: Granting "sexual orientation" the status of ethnicity and the State's legal protection would, first, defy sound reason, and second, prove a grave mistake with serious, even deadly consequences for thousands of Colorado's citizens.

We admit to being gravely concerned about the wisdom and safety of according protected class status to "sexual orientation."

If our concern over legitimizing homosexual, bisexual and lesbian behavior were **unreasoned**, we would indeed be guilty of prejudice, as "homosexual rights" supporters claim. But **reasoned** distrust, grounded in knowledge of a host of significant facts about that lifestyle would not be prejudice, but prudence.

The question we must face is this:

Would society be correct in giving protection to homosexuality, bisexuality and lesbianism -- or does society in fact need protection from some of the consequences of these behaviors?

Homosexuals would be the chief beneficiaries of any proposed legislation protecting "sexual orientation." And homosexuals, together with bisexuals and lesbians, by their own admission share only one attribute on which they base their spurious claim to ethnic status: They perform sexual acts with members of the same gender.

Robin Miller, a lesbian attorney residing in Colorado Springs, has admitted as much, writing, "**All** being gay means, fundamentally, is that a person loves members of the same sex, rather than of the other" (Colorado Springs "Gazette Telegraph," April, 1991, emphasis added).

Thus, homosexuals' claim to ethnic status is founded on nothing more than **a shared mode of behavior**. And behavior alone is no compelling basis on which to claim ethnicity.

Again, governments in America have granted civil rights on the basis of birth characteristics, like race, color, gender or national origin. Colorado also extends special protection to people of good character who are physically handicapped, whether from birth or by unchosen accident or disease, through no deliberate fault or behavior.

No rational person would argue that another was immoral simply because he or she was black, or female, or blind. True ethnicity is not behavior, moral or immoral. Being black isn't a behavior. Being a man or woman isn't a behavior. Being Hispanic isn't a behavior. Homosexuality **is** a behavior -- and one whose morality has been questioned throughout history.

The U.S. Supreme Court, in "Bowers vs. Hardwick", established in a 1986 decision that homosexual practices constitute **behavior**. The Court refused to allow homosexual behavior ethnic or minority status protected by law.

For the Court's majority, Chief Justice Burger wrote, "To hold that the act of homosexual sodomy is somehow protected as a fundamental right would be to cast aside millenia of moral teaching."

One might well ask why, if homosexuality truly possesses the quality of ethnicity, this has not been self-evident to all civilizations throughout history. Only now, in our permissive era, have some in our society seen fit even to tolerate the brazen claim of homosexuals to ethnic status.

In any case, the notion that our State should award ethnic status on the basis of physical behavior alone -- **even if that behavior is shared by many, even though these individuals find that behavior highly pleasurable and difficult (or impossible) to change** -- is, as 1984 author George Orwell once said, "an idea so preposterous that only an intellectual could believe it."

Any serious attempt to analyze this premise must inevitably end in a reductio ad absurdum.

No father has ever been (or ever will be) able to say, when his son is born, "My wife just gave birth to a hardy homosexual." No wife looks at her newborn baby and says, "What a lovely little lesbian!" No doctor tells a brand-new mother, "You have a bouncing baby bisexual!"

These classifications can only be made much later, and **only on the basis of behavior.**

And on grounds this tenuous, we might as well grant ethnic status to beer drinkers, who share one pleasurable, often dangerous, physical behavior. Or to smokers, whose behavior is

discriminated against by many who don't share it.

Or, as homosexual author Marshall Kirk has in fact suggested, left-handed people. Left-handers' physically innate behavior is discriminated against by nearly every mechanical device ever invented and in current use.

A newly-released study in "The New England Journal of Medicine" presented statistical evidence that left-handed individuals live an average of nine years less than right-handed people.

Left-handers are forced to endure lifetimes as objects of epithets like "southpaw" and "lefty." "Left-wing" is a term with highly sinister connotations. (The word "sinister" itself derives from a Latin word for left-handedness.)

Left-handed people may well outnumber homosexuals in our society. Yet society seems to feel no compulsion to launch a left-handers' liberation movement -- and we hope we don't give anyone a notion to do so by saying so!

Various strains of habitual criminals would also fulfill "shared behavior" qualifications. Some students of human behavior theorize that criminals may be born with faulty chromosome structures. Should we immediately award ethnic status and legal protection to the behaviors of sociopaths simply because these may be the product of twisted genes?

To say that society has no right to proscribe or regulate behaviors or phenomena simply because they are innate or "natural" is patently absurd.

The striking behavior of poisonous snakes is perfectly natural. Do we argue that "because snakebites are natural" people ought to welcome them and not protect themselves?

Urination and defecation are obviously natural behaviors, and shared by all human beings. Does it follow that in a civilized society, public performance of these functions should be a protected civil right?

The dreaded disease AIDS is a "natural" phenomenon. Does it follow that society should take no steps to control it?

Rational people don't seriously suggest we grant ethnic status to all innate or "natural" shared behaviors or phenomena, though all have equal grounds in logic (or illogic) with homosexuality to be granted "protected class" status.

Thus, it would be patently ridiculous to award ethnic status and special privileges **solely** on the basis of how some people

choose to gratify their sexual appetites.

For this reason, alone, legitimate minorities should be wary of identifying with the cause of "homosexual rights." Should having sex with someone be all it takes gain full minority privileges? The rights of legitimate ethnic groups weren't won so easily, or on such flimsy and ignoble grounds.

If having sex becomes all it takes to be "ethnic," the concept of ethnicity will soon lose all traces of meaning or value.

Relevance of "Behavior" Argument to Proposed Legislation

Now, those who wish to see "sexual orientation" added to this State's civil rights statutes claim the argument that behavior doesn't equal ethnicity is irrelevant in this debate.

Not so. In fact, **both** the Colorado State House Judiciary Committee and the Colorado Springs City Council have recently rejected "sexual orientation" legislation **precisely because** they recognized that behavior **does not** equal ethnicity.

The legislators clearly expressed their agreement **that behavior alone cannot compel the granting of ethnic status.** They based their judgment on sound, plain-sense reasoning, in no way colored by what the media described as "bigoted abuse" or what one homosexual called as "verbal fisting."

It is absolutely relevant to recognize that passing legislation of this sort would indeed grant homosexual behavior equal status with ethnicity. Those who can't (or won't) perceive this are either short-sighted -- or simply determined to make the equation a reality without acknowledging it.

Implications of Establishing Behavior = Ethnicity Precedent

Proponents of homosexual rights legislation will perhaps grant this: If we establish a precedent allowing ethnic status to be granted on the basis of shared sexual behavior **alone**, it **logically** follows that other groups sharing other sexual behaviors should have the right to leverage that precedent to secure the same status.

But proponents don't wish to acknowledge that society has every right **and often a compelling duty** not only to endorse, protect and privilege, but to **proscribe or condemn** particular behaviors **as it sees fit**, after **full, objective evaluation** of particular behaviors' likely effect on the public's health and general welfare.

Granted, nothing in our Constitution prevents us from

granting special protection to shared behaviors we perceive to be beneficial.

Religion is, arguably, a shared (and historically often persecuted) behavior, not a true form of ethnicity. Yet our society has from the beginning perceived benefits in protecting and encouraging the practice of religion. Accordingly, we have forbidden the federal government to establish a state church and guaranteed our citizenry the free exercise of religion.

On the contrary, society has seen fit to withhold its blessing and protection from other shared behaviors -- murder, theft and fraud, and "sexual orientations" like necrophilia, bestiality and pedophilia.

When people act out these behaviors, society reacts with punishment -- because these "orientations" obviously represent a clear and present danger to the physical, mental, cultural and spiritual health of the citizenry.

Society Must Evaluate Potential Dangers Before Awarding "Sexual Orientation" Special Privileges

It would be only prudent and reasonable for this State, before granting legal protection to any behavior, to closely examine the full consequences to our people of such action.

Before we grant ethnic status solely on the basis of "sexual orientation," we would be less than responsible not to first apply thorough and objective health, safety and constitutional analyses to the behaviors of such legislation's chief beneficiaries, homosexuals.

Proponents protest heatedly. But are we excused from employing practical, common-sense analysis simply because an issue is controversial and emotionally charged? We think not.

As a basis for their "rights" claim, homosexuals constantly assert, "we're just like everyone else." We question the validity of that statement. Is homosexuality, as homosexuals state in their manifesto, "The 1972 Gay Rights Platform," a "valid, healthy preference and lifestyle ... a viable alternative to heterosexuality"?

Closely examined, homosexual behaviors, as commonly practiced, raise immediate, serious questions about their potential impact on public health and safety.

We regret having to review the following evidence. However, these are findings of science and a matter of public record. And we must consider them if Colorado is to soundly and thoroughly understand what is at stake in legally approving homosexual

behavior.

Homosexuals and the Young

Society has agreed that ethnic status and special protection should not be awarded to child molesters. Yet it's common knowledge that homosexuals are notorious seducers of minors.

The Gay Report, a survey by Jay and Young, two homosexual researchers (Summit Books, 1979), revealed that 73% of homosexuals surveyed had at some time had sex with boys 16-19 years of age or younger (p.275). J.C. Coleman, in Abnormal Psychology and Modern Life (1964) lists early homosexual experience as the main cause of homosexuality. His finding was that more than 50% of adult homosexuals had been seduced by older homosexuals before the age of 14.

A survey in "The British Journal of Sexual Medicine" (April, 1987) reported the mean age of homosexuals' first sexual encounters with other males as 15 years and one month.

Homosexuals are, statistically (based on a generous estimate of their representing 4% of the population), about 18 times more likely to engage in sexual practices with minors than heterosexuals are. Crime statistics reveal that about 31% of children younger than 13 who claim to have been molested by men were homosexually assaulted ("Child Molestation and Homosexuality," Institute for the Scientific Investigation of Sexuality, 1987).

See also Psychological Reports, 1986, #58, pp. 327-337, which reveal that homosexuals, while representing perhaps 2% of the population, perpetrate more than 1/3 of all reported child molestations.

In a national random survey of 4,340 adults, 96% of heterosexual males and 97% of normal females reported that their first sexual experience was heterosexual. 85% of homosexuals and 29% of lesbians reported their first sexual experience as bisexual or homosexual ("Nebraska Medical Journal," August, 1985).

It's scarcely surprising, then, that homosexual rights manifestos such as "The 1972 Gay Rights Platform" have consistently called upon government to (1) "Repeal all state laws prohibiting private sexual acts involving consenting persons [not consenting adults]," and for (2) "Repeal of all laws governing the age of sexual consent."

"Homosexual rights" supporters infer that homosexuals are less of a threat to the innocence of the young than heterosexuals, because "heterosexuals commit a majority of child

molestations."

However, since heterosexuals make up nearly 98% of society, it would be extraordinarily surprising if they did **not** perpetrate a majority of child molestations.

What **is** extraordinary is the amount of child molestation committed by homosexuals relative to their presence in the general population.

Homosexuals and Sexually Transmitted Diseases

Surely society should think twice about awarding ethnic status to or protecting the behavior of our most persistent communicators of sexually transmitted diseases.

Yet "homosexual rights" legislation would grant just such status and protection to homosexual behavior, which results in extraordinary levels of virulent, sexually transmitted disease.

Public health statistics reveal beyond question that incidence of diseases like gonorrhea, syphillis, hepatitis A and B, cytomegalovirus, amoebic bowel disease and herpes among homosexuals far exceeds those of the general population.

Public health records demonstrate that homosexuals, who represent perhaps 2% of America's population, suffer upwards of 80% of America's most serious sexually transmitted diseases -- afflictions acquired directly through sexual behavior homosexuals are asking this state to legally endorse and protect.

Male homosexuals (again, based on a generous 4% estimate of their presence in the population) are 14 times more likely to have had syphilis than heterosexuals. Eight times more likely to have had hepatitis A or B. (Hepatitis B, once contracted, cannot be cured. Only the immunization of sexual partners can prevent its spread. Both forms of hepatitis are more easily transmissable than AIDS.)

Homosexuals are hundreds of times more likely to have had oral infection by sexually transmitted diseases through penile contact. Thousands of times more likely to have AIDS. (Jaffe and Keewhan, et. al., "National Case-Control Study of Kaposi's Sarcoma, etc. in Homosexual Men; Part 1, Epidemiologic Results," Annals of Internal Medicine, 1983, 99 (2), pp. 145-157)

[Compared with heterosexual females, lesbians are 19 times more likely to have had syphilis. Twice as likely to have genital warts (which a sufferer carries, and can transmit, for life). Four times as likely to have had scabies. Seven times more likely to have had infection from vaginal contact. 29 times more likely to have had oral infection from vaginal contact. And

12 times more likely to have had an oral infection from penile contact ("Medical Aspects of Homosexuality," Institute for the Scientific Investigation of Sexuality, 1985; Jaffe and Keewhan, et. al., op. cit.).]

After passage of homosexual rights laws in San Francisco, the city saw a sharp increase in venereal disease -- up to 22 times the national average. By 1979, approximately 80% of the 75,000 people who visited San Francisco venereal disease clinics were homosexuals ("San Francisco Examiner," April 23, 1979).

AIDS Transmitted by Homosexual Behavior, Not "Straight" Bigotry

We must discuss AIDS. While, of course, all homosexuals do not suffer from AIDS, homosexual behavior is far and away the most frequent means by which this always fatal disease is transmitted.

On October 15th, 1990, the Colorado Department of Health, Tom Vernon, Director, issued data that implicates homosexual behavior in approximately 85% of the 1,500 AIDS cases reported in this state as of the end of September, 1990. 85.2% of these cases have occured in the Denver Metropolitan area alone.

The U.S. Army has estimated the average cost of carrying an HIV-infected patient from time of infection through death from symptomatic AIDS is about $250,000. It is estimated that AIDS-related illness will cost America as a whole at least $60 billion in 1991 alone. Cumulative medical costs of AIDS treatment could exceed $1.5 trillion within 10 years. Insurance industry estimate range as high as $50 billion for AIDS-related claims for the 1990s. No cure for AIDS is in sight.

Medical science has ascertained that anal receptive sex and other body-substance and fluid exchanges commonly practiced by homosexuals are biologically the most efficient methods of transmiting AIDS.

Such practices include fisting (fully inserting one's fist into a partner's rectum); oral-anal sex and the ingestion of urine and fesces (an exhaustive study published in "The New England Journal of Medicine," 1980, 302, indicated that homosexuals ingest, on the average, the fecal material of 23 different men each year); and of course, oral-genital sex (through ingestion of semen), which has recently been indicted in several cases of AIDS.

Recent research demonstrates that the AIDS virus can be carried in saliva, and is conceivably transferable by such activities as "soul kissing" ("AIDS from a deep kiss: 'Very low risk', USA Today, pg. 1, Fri./Sat./Sun., June 21-23, 1991).

AIDS transmission is also apparently possible by accident through intrusive surgery and dental treatment. In a recent, celebrated case, Kimberly Bergalis, a 22-year-old Florida woman, contracted HIV infection while having teeth removed by Dr. David Acer, a bisexual dentist, without having participated in what has been considered high-risk activity.

Researchers believe it is also possible for HIV infection to be passed from patient to patient in medical or dental procedures, through inadequately sterilized instruments. The American Medical and Dental Associations have very recently authorized special lengthy precautions for sterilization that will necessitate the purchase by physicians and dentists of nearly twice as many instruments to facilitate patient treatment at normal speeds -- at a cost which will doubtless be passed on to patients.

The A.M.A. and A.D.A. have also called for medical/dental personnel with HIV infection to either inform their patients or stop performing invasive medical procedures.

Proponents of homosexual rights legislation try to make "anti-homosexual bigotry" the scapegoat for the spread of AIDS. But, while opponents of such legislation are cognizant of the intense grief and anxiety the AIDS epidemic has brought to homosexuals, the fact is that it is the persistently dangerous sexual behavior of homosexuals themselves that has contributed most to the spread of AIDS.

"Safe Sex?"

Some argue that we need no longer be concerned about the prevalence of sexually transmitted diseases among homosexuals because of the effects of what some call "safe sex" education programs and practices.

Medical authorities disagree widely as to whether "safe sex" -- use of condoms to prevent exchange of body fluids -- is a truly effective means of disease protection. Condoms have a high failure rate, especially when aggravated by vigorous sexual activity, such as certain practices homosexuals often engage in.

(In fact, on July 27, 1991, the A.M.A. ordered recall of all lambskin condoms because these **do not prevent** transmission of viral organisms. **Only** rubber or latex condoms will be regarded as "safe" by the A.M.A. -- and these have shown dangerous failure rates as well.)

In any case, recent studies indicate that even thoroughly "safe sex" educated homosexuals tend, after a few months of practicing "safe sex", to revert to former unhealthy practices,

often because "safe sex" simply isn't as pleasurable as their customary behavior.

Nor do "safe sex" considerations seem to curb the promiscuity of homosexuals. In a study of the sexual behavior of 1034 single homosexual San Francisco men between June, 1984 and January, 1985, it was determined that, even after several years of community-wide "safe sex" education, nearly 20% had over 50 sexual contacts in the two years prior to the study. This calculates to more than one new partner **every two weeks for two solid years.**

Dr. W. Winkelstein, author of the study, wrote:

> "The findings reported here, along with the other reports . . . support the inference that sexual transmission of HIV infection in homosexual/bisexual men in San Francisco, during the current AIDS epidemic, **has largely been a function of the numbers of sexual contacts and the practice of receptive anal/genital contact among them**" [emphasis added] (Winkelstein, W., "Sexual Practices and Risk of Infection by the Human Immunodeficiency Virus," The San Francisco Men's Health Study, JAMA, 16 January, 1987, Vol 257, #3, p. 323).

In a Time magazine, July 2, 1990, article, "A Losing Battle With AIDS," a survey of San Francisco homosexuals between the ages of 18 and 25 reported that **46% of those polled admitted having engaged in anal intercourse without a condom during the past month.**

This article echoes a San Francisco Department of Health survey of homosexual men, released in June, 1991:

- Nearly 43% of young homosexual men ages 17-19 were currently engaging in condom-unprotected anal intercourse.
- So were 24.7% of 20-22-year-olds, and 29.9% of 23-25-year-olds.

Every young man surveyed knew about AIDS and what constitutes high-risk behavior. Asked why they didn't use condoms, some admitted to being under the influence of drugs or alcohol at the time they practiced unprotected sex. Others said they were "too much in love" to care, or that their partners "looked healthy."

Researchers at the 1990 International Conference on AIDS reported that, though the percentages of homosexuals practicing "safe sex" had risen in the previous four years, and high-risk behavior overall had dropped . . .

- Homosexual and bisexual men under age 30 were twice as likely to engage in unprotected anal sex as older men.

- Half of black homosexual men continued to engage in anal intercourse without a condom.

- In smaller U.S. cities where the full brunt of AIDS has not yet hit, homosexual men practice unsafe sex at rates as much as **three times higher** than in larger, urban areas.

- 19% of homosexual and bisexual men who practiced "safe sex" reported relapsing to unsafe behavior over a four-year period.

Researchers also concluded that "simply being informed about the AIDS virus does not make people any more likely to practice safe sex" (Above findings as reported in The Washington Post, Sunday, June 24, 1990).

Other 1990 International AIDS Conference studies presented evidence that:

40% of homosexual men relapsed into unsafe sexual behavior over a 16-month study period (St. Lawrence, J., et. al., University of Mississipi, Jackson, Mississippi, Abstract F.C. 725).

"Why are young men engaging in high rates of unsafe sex? ... " Their chief reason? "Greater enjoyment" (Hays, B., et. al., University of California at San Francisco, Abstract F.C. 722).

"Continued use of multiple recreational drugs including 'poppers' (volatile nitrites) is related to continued high risk sexual behavior in a cohort of homosexual men (Ostrow, D., et. al., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Abstract F.C. 726).

120 HIV-infected homosexual men completed an anonymous questionnaire up to nine months after becoming aware of their HIV-positive status. Over half of the sexually-active sample reported **they did not tell their new partners of their HIV infection** (Brown, S., et. al., Westminster Hospital, London, England, Abstract S.C. 652).

Incidentally, a Denver magazine for homosexuals, Quest, in its April, 1991, issue (p. 12), reported survey findings that, among Denver homosexuals, condom use during anal-receptive sex had fallen from 42.7% in 1989 to 36.5% in 1990.

"Even more alarming," the article states, "22.4% ... said

they sometimes did not use condoms during anal intercourse." 67.3% admitted not always "or usually" using condoms during oral sex.

Even homosexual authors Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen, in their book, After the Ball (Doubleday, New York, 1989, pp. 299-300) review such facts and comment:

> "None of this is to say that the gay community has made no changes in its sex practices. But sweeping as such changes may be, don't kid yourself: a very sizable proportion of gay men continue to show such callous disregard -- and we think it's monstrous."

Homosexuals Want to Be Recognized as "Normal"

Nevertheless, homosexuals loudly demand that society regard them as "just like everyone else." And that society recognize and protect their behavior as a "normal, if divergent, lifestyle."

Recently, the head of a Denver homosexual coalition claimed opponents of pro-homosexual legislation "failed to distinguish between sexual orientation and sexual deviance."

Webster's Third International Dictionary defines "to deviate" as "to turn aside, especially from an established way." Studies of homosexual behavior clearly demonstrate radical deviance from society's norms.

AIDS research released in 1982 by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control reported that the typical homosexual interviewed claimed to have had over 500 different sexual partners in a lifetime. Considered by themselves, the AIDS victims in this study averaged more than 1,100 lifetime sexual partners. Some reported as many as 20,000. A psychologist we have interviewed tells of counseling a homosexual clergyman who claimed more than 900 sexual partners to date.

In perhaps the most thorough study of homosexual behavior ever undertaken, published by the Kinsey Institute in Bell and Weinberg's book Homosexualities, A Study of Diversity Among Men and Women (New York, Simon and Schuster, 1978, pp. 308-309) we read that:

- 43% of white male homosexuals estimated they had sex with 500 or more different partners. 28% reported more than 1,000 partners.

- 79% said more than half their partners were strangers.

- 70% said more than half their sexual partners were men with

whom they had sex only once.

A study of San Francisco homosexuals published in "Psychology Today," (February, 1981) revealed that 28% of homosexuals surveyed had engaged in sodomy with more than 1,000 partners. An additional 70% had more than 50 partners.

Studies reported by A.P. Bell, M.S. Weinberg and S.K. Hammersmith in the book Sexual Preference (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1981) indicated that only 3% of homosexuals had fewer than 10 lifetime sexual partners. Only about 2% could be classified as either monogamous or semi-monogamous.

Still other studies indicate that "monogamy" for homosexuals lasts from between 9 to 60 months (Gebhard, P.H., and Johnson, A.B., The Kinsey Data, Sanders, 1979; Bell, Weinberg and Hammersmith, Sexual Preference, op. cit.; "The Psychology of Homosexuality," Institute for the Scientific Investigation of Sexuality, 1984).

(Hunter and Madsen, in After the Ball, pg. 330, admit: "... the cheating ratio of 'married' gay males, given enough time, approaches 100% ... Many gay lovers, bowing to the inevitable, agree to an 'open relationship,' for which there are as many sets of ground rules as there are couples.")

A 1984 study by the American Psychological Association's Ethics Committee, referred to in USA Today (November 21, 1984), indicated that fear of AIDS had lowered homosexuals' promiscuity rate from 70 different partners a year in 1982 to 50 partners per year by 1984.

At this "safe sex" rate, a homosexual from ages 18-30 **would still total over 600 sexual partners.**

In a letter to the editor of the American Journal of Public Health (December, 1985, 75, pp. 11449-1450), Dr. Hunter Handsfield, Director of Seattle, Washington's Sexually Transmitted Disease Control Program, noted that, in the face of the AIDS epidemic, these changes in behavior are "almost ludicrous."

A recent, large-scale study of sexuality among Roman Catholic priests (presented to the 98th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, August, 1990, by A.W. Richard Sipe) reported that approximately 6-8% of heterosexual priests were sexually active. **But sexual activity among homosexually-oriented priests was at levels of approximately 50%.**

By contrast, for the U.S. population as a whole, a University of Chicago survey (Adult Sexual Behavior in 1989: Number of Partners, Frequency and Risk, presented to the American

Association for the Advancement of Science, February, 1990, published 1990 by NORC, University of Chicago) concluded that the estimated number of lifetime sexual partners since age 18 **is 7.15 (only 8.67 for those who never married).**

(Incidentally, evidence exists of high levels of lesbian promiscuity, which correlate with previously-mentioned high disease-incidence statistics among lesbians. Jay and Young's Gay Report (pg. 5) revealed 38% of lesbians surveyed had between 11 and more than 300 lifetime sexual partners -- far beyond the norm for heterosexual women.)

Deviance in homosexual behavior is not only a matter of frequency, but of kind practiced. For example, one-third of homosexuals and one-eighth of lesbians admit to practicing sadomasochism (hurting or being hurt as a part of achieving sexual pleasure). This is a rate at least 600% greater than heterosexual males and 400% more than claimed by heterosexual females ("Murder, Violence and Homosexuality," Institute for the Scientific Investigation of Sexuality, 1987; cf. Gebhard, P.H., and Johnson, A.B., The Kinsey Data, Sanders, 1979).

Similarly, one-fourth of homosexual males and 8% of lesbians admit to urinating on sexual partners; again, rates over 450% higher than for heterosexuals (op. cit., paragraph preceding).

Not surprisingly, the program brochure of the "13th National Gay and Lesbian Health Conference," scheduled for July 24-28, 1991, includes a workshop entitled "Normalizing S/M [sado-masochism]: A Non-DSM IIIR Approach." We quote from its description (p. 18):

> "This workshop is an attempt to explore s/m as a **normal sexual identity, despite** the DSMIIIR [the American Psychiatric Association's list of psychological disorders] assessment of it as a psychosexual disorder." [emphasis added]

Significantly, several recent studies seriously question the 10% 1948 Kinsey research figure often quoted by homosexuals to suggest a large homosexual presence in the general population.

Kinsey's data base was clearly skewed by his choice to include a high percentage of prison inmates, who practice homosexual behavior much more frequently than men outside prison walls (Ref. Kinsey, Sex and Fraud, Reisman and Eichel, Lochinvar-Huntington House pub., 1990).

Tom W. Smith's much more recent, previously cited study Adult Sexual Behavior in 1989: Numbers of Partners, Frequency and Risk, conducted among a full probability sample of the the adult U.S. household population, reported that "Overall . . . less than

Some also believe that, under pro-"sexual orientation" legislation, payments to homosexual AIDS patients may threaten to drain Social Security's trust fund for retirees.

Rather than accepting blame for "victimizing" homosexuals, should not society reassert its right to **protect itself** against the onslaught of homosexuals' heedless behavioral license?

Argument to the Beard

Attempting to shore up their claim to "normality," homosexuals lastly argue that: (1) Wildly promiscuous heterosexuals also exist. (2) The range of "normality" is vast.

Their argument is known in logic as the "fallacy of the beard." It's like insisting that the face of a man whose morning shave has missed one whisker is just as hairy as the face of a man with a full beard.

No reasonable person can equate the promiscuity levels or disease incidence statistics of the homosexual population with those of the general population.

And homosexuals' promiscuity and disease statistics cited here are not the paranoid delusions of fundamentalist heterosexual bigots. They derive from legitimate scientific research and reliable statistical analysis. They're a matter of public record.

Homosexuals don't want this kind of information publicized. Homosexual writers Marshall Kirk and Erastes Pill admitted as much in their 1987 Guide magazine article, "The Overhauling of Straight America," which outlines media and public relations strategies for winning protected status for homosexuals (as well as in Kirk's previously-mentioned After the Ball). On page 8, they say:

> "In the early stages of any campaign to reach straight America, the masses should not be exposed to homo**sexual** behavior itself. [emphasis the authors'] Instead, the imagery of sex should be downplayed and gay rights should be **reduced to an abstract social question as much as possible.** [emphasis added] First let the camel get his nose inside the tent -- and only later his unsightly derriere!"

So, homosexuals accuse opponents who reveal such information of bigotry, verbal abuse or "gay bashing." But facts do not hate. They simply **are**. And society would be highly irresponsible not to take these facts into account before we consider granting homosexual behavior ethnic status and legal protection.

Is homosexuality "a healthy, if divergent lifestyle"?

Perhaps the most conclusive evidence of all that homosexuality is anything but healthy has recently been compiled by Family Research Institute founder Dr. Paul Cameron. (Homosexuals gnash their teeth at many of Cameron's findings, but have failed to successfully discredit his research.)

In his just-released study The Homosexual Life-Span, Cameron compared 4,153 homosexual or lesbian obituaries from 10 homosexual journals with a randon sample of obituaries from urban newspapers. He concluded (study pg. 1):

> "[The urban newspaper obituaries] were very similar to national averages for longevity: the median age of death of married men was 75, 80% died old (65 or older); the median age for unmarried men was 57, 32% died old. The median age of death for married women was 79, 85% died old; the median age for unmarried women was 71, 60% died old.
>
> "For the 4,083 homosexual deaths, the median age of death if AIDS was the listed cause was 39, irrespective of whether or not the individual had a long time sexual partner [LSTP], <1% died old; the median age of death from unlisted causes was 38 if the individual had a LTSP, 45 if he did not, 1% of both groups died old.
>
> "For those 414 homosexuals who died of non-AIDS causes, the median age of death was 43 and 7% died old ...
>
> "The 70 lesbians registered a median age of death of 45 and 24% died old. Lesbians exhibited high rates of violent death and cancer as compared to women in general."

Cameron comments: "The discrepancy between the median life-span of married men and homosexuals (i.e., 75-43=32 years ignoring AIDS deaths) or married women and lesbians (i.e., 79-45=34 years) is considerably larger than any registered discrepancy between life-styles (e.g., smokers v. non-smokers) which we could locate in the [medical] literature."

Cameron has also discovered a curious fact in scientific literature regarding homosexuals compiled from 1858 to 1990: "Old homosexuals have been significantly absent or proportionately less numerous than their heterosexual counterparts ... The pattern of early death evident in the homosexual obituaries is consistent with the pattern exhibited in the published surveys of homosexuals" (pg. 1).

The Health Verdict is In

The verdict on homosexual activity's impact on public health

1% [of the study population] has been exclusively homosexual."

Likewise highly suspect and tainted is the homosexual community's vaunted "normality victory," gained in 1973, when the American Psychiatric Association removed homosexuality from its DSMII listing of psychological disorders.

The 60% of APA members voting in favor of this decision did so under enormous intimidating pressure by homosexual activists. As Dr. Joseph Nicolosi wrote in the February, 1989, issue of The California Psychologist, "Many members of our profession still privately express the opinion that homosexual development is not normal. The 1973 APA ruling did not resolve the issue -- it simply silenced 80 years of psychoanalytic observation."

Ironically, in late 1977, 68% of American Medical Association psychiatrists responding to a poll **still viewed homosexuality as a pathological adaptation** as opposed to a normal variation (reported in "Hope for Homosexuality," Free Congress Foundation, 1988, p. 53).

Homosexuals respond to presentation of such data by arguing that it is a repressive society that drives homosexuals to compulsive and dangerous sexual behavior. I.e., because society does not support committed homosexual relationships, homosexuals are "forced" into the counterculture of bars, bathhouses and other cruising places.

This assertion can't stand up to analysis. 50 or 60 years ago, society almost universally condemned heterosexual pre- and extramarital sex. Yet no such incredible levels of heterosexual promiscuity were in evidence.

Today, in those places like New York City, San Francisco, and Laguna Beach, California, where male homosexual relationships are most accepted and legally protected, the level of promiscuity remains enormously high relative to the general population.

These cities also retain the highest levels of AIDS cases and the highest levels of sexually transmitted disease infection in the homosexual community.

Though they also largely blame society, homosexual authors Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen admit, in their book, After the Ball (Doubleday, New York, 1989, pp. 47, 48):

> "There is more promiscuity among gays (or at least among gay men) than among straights . . . Correspondingly, the snail trail of promiscuity -- sexually transmitted disease -- also occurs among gay men at a rate five to ten times higher than average."

Studies of homosexual (and highly promiscuous heterosexual) behavior, and of frequent users of pornography, strongly suggest that sexual license does not assuage sexual appetite -- but rather increases both appetite and frequency of behavior.

Dare society protect the behavior of or consider normal highly promiscuous individuals whose actions may expose millions of sexual partners -- and innocent contactees -- to a host of highly communicable, even incurable, diseases?

Dare we ignore the potential impact of such behavior in sensitive occupations like health care, child care and food care? We think not.

Numerous diseases most frequently suffered by homosexuals, including hepatitis A and B, are transmittable by the kind of hand-to mouth contact common in these occupations.

As previously mentioned, AIDS transmission, both from health care workers to patients, and from patients to health care workers (then possibly to other patients), is increasingly becoming a public issue.

Some argue that the incidence of such transmission in such settings is too low to be of great concern. They continue to argue against mandatory testing of either caregivers or patients.

We beg to differ. Are we to regard the "right" to continue practicing dangerous, deviant sex as more important than life itself? Is not life too precious to be sacrificed on the altar of a handful of people's perilous sexuality? Even one life lost by protecting irresponsible behavior is too many.

Tragically, the loudest defenders of an absolute right to privacy for AIDS carriers are often the same individuals who argue for protecting the "rights" of criminals at all costs. These shelterers of dangerous behavior demonstrate a warped, but "consistent" unconcern about the fate of innocent victims. We don't share their misguided sense of justice.

Few Americans would be sympathetic to the idea that taxpayers should pay the medical costs of smokers who refused to quit smoking and consequently developed lung cancer. However, this is what AIDS-infected homosexuals want society to do.

Despite the well-known dangers of AIDS, homosexuals demand that **taxpayers**, through state and federal governments, pay for the medical care of those who contract AIDS.

Some health authorities believe that by the mid-1990s, it will be difficult for sick persons to get hospital beds because of overcrowding by AIDS-infected homosexuals.

and safety is in. Homosexuals are "not just like everyone else." They practice extremely unhealthy, even life-shortening, behavior modes, which radically deviate from the norm.

Society has largely tolerated more than two decades of increasingly unbridled homosexual activity. We have a broad base of evidence on which to decide whether or not homosexual behavior merits legal protection.

We conclude, on the basis of public health considerations alone, that the State of Colorado would be remiss in granting ethnic status and legal protection to a group of people with nothing more in common than shared sexual behavior constituting a clear danger to the public's health and safety.

The State of Colorado's Criminal Code refers to both sodomy and fornication. It defines sodomy as "deviate sexual intercourse." It prescribes penalties for the crime of "promoting sexual immorality," in section 18-7-208 (Colorado Revised Statutes, Volume 8B, 1986 Replacement Volume, Criminal Justice II), which it describes as follows:

> "Promoting sexual immorality. (1) Any person who, for pecuniary gain, furnishes or makes available to another person any facility, knowing that the same is to be used for or in aid of sexual intercourse between persons who are not husband and wife, for or in aid of **deviate sexual intercourse**, or who advertises any such facility for such purposes, commits promoting sexual immorality. [emphasis added]
>
> "(2) 'Facility', as used in this section, means any place or thing which provides seclusion, privacy, opportunity, protection, comfort, or assistance to or for a person or persons engaging or intending to engage in sexual intercourse or **deviate sexual intercourse.**" [emphasis added]

This statute might well be grounds to forbid the rental of property to homosexual or unmarried heterosexual couples.

Yet a Colorado Civil Rights Commission official, sworn to uphold the laws of this State, has been quoted as saying that he wouldn't care if 99% of Colorado's citizens voted down homosexual rights legislation by referendum. He would continue to urge Colorado's legislators to overrule the people's will -- and also, evidently, the laws of the State of Colorado.

Would such an official succumb to the demand of homosexuals for "Immediate release of all Gay women and men now incarcerated in detention centers relating to victimless crimes or sexual orientation; and that adequate compensation be made for the

physical and mental duress encountered; and that all existing records relating to the incarceration be immediately expunged" (The 1972 Gay Rights Platform)? It's all too likely.

Yet we again state this point clearly:

> Despite the willful arrogance or unwitting ignorance of these officials, **this State's citizens have every right -- and duty -- to judge dangerous behavior on its lack of merits**, and withhold our approval **as we see fit** to protect ourselves.

Constitutional Conflicts

Even beyond public health and safety concerns, we have other grounds for rejecting homosexual rights legislation. In the following pages, we will demonstrate why we believe serious civil rights abuses of **non-homosexuals** will result if we decide to grant ethnic status to "sexual orientations."

We believe equating sexual orientation with true ethnicity would eventually deprive individuals sincerely and intelligently opposing homosexual practices of certain fundamental rights and force those individuals to violate private conscience.

We believe also that pooling homosexuals, bisexuals and lesbians with legitimate ethnic groups would cause government expenditures on homosexual litigation and promotion that would rob true ethnic groups (including the handicapped) of urgently-needed resources and entitlement benefits.

Criminal Law Effects

First, the kind of pro-homosexual legislation being proposed would have effects far beyond merely penalizing crimes of physical violence (which are now redressed by criminal statutes).

Comments by homosexuals after a Colorado House Judiciary Committee hearing (on adding "sexual orientation" to the State's Ethnic Harassment Bill) made it clear that some homosexual rights advocates present regarded the mere open sharing of medical and public health facts about homosexual behavior **equivalent to felony harassment or ethnic intimidation.**

Also, homosexuals commonly report such occasions to federal authorities as "hate crimes" against homosexuals, to be tallied under the federal Hate Crimes Statistics Act of 1990.

For these reasons, we believe the rights of hundreds of thousands of non-homosexual Colorado citizens, now protected under the U.S. Constitution's First Amendment, including freedom of religion and freedom of speech, as well as other basic rights,

will eventually be jeopardized by pro-homosexual legislation.

When simply speaking the truth about matters of public record or sharing the convictions of one's conscience becomes a crime, what will become of the rights of thousands who reasonably and openly oppose homosexual behavior?

Under pro-homosexual legislation, would a Christian minister or Sunday School teacher publicly calling homosexuality a sin be guilty of verbal abuse and felony harassment?

Would a day care center owner who declines to offer a care-giver's position to an avowed homosexual (or heterosexual) AIDS sufferer be guilty of felony harassment?

Would an elderly lady of delicate sensibilities be guilty of ethnic discrimination if she refuses to rent, against conscience, a room in her small boarding house to practicing homosexuals?

Would a church face criminal prosecution and the threat of losing its tax exemption if it refused employment to a practicing homosexual?

The State of Hawaii recently passed S.B. No. 1811, legislation protecting "sexual orientation." In answer to an inquiry regarding the bill's effects on church hiring, Attorney General Warren Price wrote:

> " . . . Non-sectarian employees of the church, church-sponsored activities or programs **are not exempt.** This would include secretaries, janitors, gardeners, **teachers**, etc." [emphasis added]

Would provisions in such legislation protect religious individuals and organizations who publicly oppose homosexuality from homosexual harassment?

Early drafts of recently-defeated proposed Colorado Springs legislation protecting "sexual orientation" (written with the assistance of the homosexual community) contained, according to constitutional attorneys, conspicuous threats to citizens' rights granted under the U.S. Constitution's 1st, 4th, 5th, 6th, 9th and 14th Amendments.

Our society has always forbidden attempts to control private conscience and free speech. But we have little confidence that the rights of individuals and organizations holding traditional values would prevail when they conflict with the interests of homosexuals protected by such legislation.

We are told, "Don't worry -- cases like those we've proposed are only hypothetical. Civil rights authorities will judge each

case on its merits." But what is any law if not a statement about how government will respond to situations that may only possibly occur?

The scenarios we've presented are in fact highly likely to occur under pro-homosexual legislation. Recently, a Minnesota church was assessed $20,000 in damages and $15,000 in fines -- because the church refused to allow a homosexual club to hold meetings in church facilities.

Under a recent Wisconsin decision, two heterosexual women were fined a total of $1,500, and each required to write letters of apology, compelled to attend "sensitivity" classes taught by lesbians in which they were forcibly exposed to graphic depictions of homosexual behavior, and forbidden to ask further rental applicants about their "sexual orientation."

Their crime? Refusing to share their apartment with a lesbian applicant.

Wisconsin's former Governor Lee Sherman Dreyfus was responsible for signing that state's "sexual orientation" bill into law. He was assured that the bill would not affect religious institutions like the 40-year-old Rawhide Boys' Ranch, a home for troubled boys.

Shortly after Dreyfus left office, two male homosexuals appeared at the Ranch, demanding to be hired as boys' counselors. Dreyfus later wrote the bill's supporters, expressing his sense of betrayal at the homosexual community's breach of promise.

Under "sexual orientation" legislation, we can expect a plethora of nuisance suits and test cases to clog our legal system, bleed defendants dry financially -- and grant enormous coercive and investigative powers and bloated bureaucratic budgets to unelected "civil rights" officials who treat such complaints.

Special Rights for Homosexuals

Contrary to their assertions, homosexuals enjoy the same rights guaranteed under our Constitution to other law-abiding citizens.

But we conclude that pro-homosexual legislation would grant practicing homosexuals special rights and privileges, and thereby create serious constitutional conflicts related to equal protection under the law.

Once such legislation establishes a behavior-equals-ethnicity precedent, preferential treatment in the form of affirmative action, quotas, set-asides, marriage and adoption

rights, etc. will surely follow.

The experiences of several of our number who've worked in businesses protecting "sexual orientation" lead us to believe non-homosexuals would also suffer severe harassment and reverse discrimination in the workplace.

College and university students report reverse discrimination and harassment by homosexuals and pro-homosexual professors in "politically correct" educational environments.

In his recently published book, Illiberal Education, minority author Dinesh D'Souza reports the following incident:

> "Graduate student Jerome Pinn checked into his dormitory at the University of Michigan to discover that his roommate had covered the walls with posters of nude men.
>
> "When the young man told Pinn he was an active homosexual who expected to have partners over, Pinn approached the Michigan housing office and asked to be transferred to another room. 'They were outraged by this,' Pinn says. 'They asked me what **my** problem was. I said that I had a religious and moral objection to homosexual conduct. They were surprised; they couldn't believe it.'"

Of course, in Colorado public schools, homosexual-promoting, value-free sex and "AIDS" education have also made deep inroads.

Right now, Denver public school teachers and counselors are being pressured and trained to teach children that homosexuality is a normal lifestyle **beginning in kindergarten** (See The Denver Post, Dec. 2, 1990, p. 1).

This despite evidence that a teenager induced into homosexual behavior **has a one in four chance of contracting AIDS within five years** (Gay and Lesbian Youth, Harrington Press, 1989, p. 185).

Homosexuals have often expressed deep hostility to traditional, Judeo-Christian beliefs and values. A newly-released Denver Public Schools Health and Science Education teachers' guide entitled "Gay and Lesbian Youth Tools for Educators" states bluntly:

> "There **is no biblical sex ethic**. The Bible knows **only a love ethic**, which is constantly being brought to bear on whatever sexual mores are dominant in a given country, culture or period." [emphasis added]

Included with this guide is a questionnaire designed to be answered by heterosexual high school students. It asks, among others, these questions:

"5. Is it possible that all you need is a good gay lover?

. . .

7. If you have never slept with a person of the same sex, how do you know that you would not prefer to do so?

. . .

14. How can you hope to become a whole person if you limit yourself to an exclusive heterosexual object choice and remain unwilling to explore and develop your normal, natural, healthy homosexual potential?"

Writings by homosexuals, such as Teal's The Gay Militants, Jay and Young's Out of the Closets and Tobin and Wicker's The Gay Crusaders, often express the conviction that all organizaed religions should be condemned for aiding in the so-called "genocide" of homosexuals.

They may well be familiar with studies such as that conducted by the Institute for the Scientific Investigation of Sexuality, entitled "What Causes Homosexuality and Can It Be Cured?" (ISIS, 1984) This study demonstrated that children raised in non-religious homes have a 450% greater chance of choosing to practice homosexual behavior.

We believe the manifest instability of homosexuals' behavior offers little hope for ongoing success in marriage or child-rearing. Certainly, dysfunction can also be found in traditional families. But again, no reasonable comparison can be made of traditional family behavior with the obviously psyche-destroying stress induced by diseased, promiscuous homosexual relationships.

Legitimization of homosexual "marriages" would only erode traditional family structures, sap financial resources from legitimate, traditional families (by increasing disease-driven insurance rates, etc.) and cause measureless misery to helpless children, who would be the most wretched victims of such "marriages."

A Retreat, Not an Advance, in Civil Rights

To sum up, we believe that allowing "sexual orientation" the status of ethnicity would not be an advance in civil rights, but a retreat -- a clear and present threat to the civil rights, physical, spiritual and mental health of the State of Colorado and its people.

One frequently-heard argument used to justify pro-homosexual legislation says:

"This is a simple civil rights issue. **Every** person has an inalienable right to behave or express him/herself and pursue happiness as he/she chooses."

Such a categorical "right" simply doesn't exist. A person's ability to continue pursuing life, liberty and happiness always depends on their maintaining good behavior -- **as judged by society.** In many of our United States today, acts of murder cause individuals to forfeit all three of these basic rights.

Again, society **must** make judgments about which behaviors it will condone and which it cannot. This is why we have laws, prisons and homes for the mentally-impaired.

Homosexual behavior, like all other behavior, is subject to society's judgment -- a judgment which, we believe, should not result in that behavior's protection.

FINAL, BASELESS ARGUMENTS

Lastly, we must be careful not to be driven to give homosexual behavior protected class status by fallacious arguments like the following:

"Fairness/Compassion" Argument

Some say those who would deny legal status to "sexual orientation" are "unfair" or "lack compassion." This is not a moral issue, they say, but a fairness issue. Proponents of "homosexual rights" legislation claim morality ought not to be an issue here. We beg to differ. Nowhere does our Constitution demand moral relativism.

We answer, it is impossible to define fairness or compassion without refering to some moral code or ethical standard. And by what code or standard do homosexuals imagine it would be fair or compassionate for this State to give our legal approval or protection to behavior that harms nearly all who practice it -- and threatens the health and civil rights of thousands more people impacted by it?

Proponents insist we are "trying to impose our morality on society." We ask: What right allows homosexuals and their supporters to demand society's acceptance and protection of their dangerously promiscuous behavior?

While they accuse opponents of "homosexual rights" of mixing questions of church and state, homosexuals are often quick to appeal -- backed by the eager testimony and the active assistance of "liberal" clergy -- to a falsely-construed "biblical" compassion ethic of their own to support their cause.

True Scriptural compassion never condones wrongdoing -- especially persistently self-centered behavior that harms others. It offers grace to wrongdoers -- on condition that they repent of and forsake behavior destructive to themselves and others.

Jesus said to the adulterous woman he saved from stoning, "Go, and sin **no** more" not "Go and sin **much** more."

It is not "compassionate" to pretend that homosexual behavior is normal and healthy for homosexuals, any more than it would be compassionate to encourage alcoholics to "celebrate" drunkenness.

Homosexual leaders have themselves admitted the deficiencies of homosexual lifestyles. Kirk and Madsen say: "In short, the gay lifestyle -- if such a chaos can, after all, legitimately be **called** a lifestyle -- just doesn't work: it doesn't serve the two functions for which all social frameworks evolve: to constrain people's natural impulses to behave badly and to meet their natural needs" (After the Ball, pg. 363).

Kirk and Madsen's antidote? Of all things, some sort of moral or social code of their **own** devising! "What gay men want, without knowing it," they say, "is **a return to a sense of the sacred**, and **a framework of ethics** within which they can begin to trust and believe in one another" (After the Ball, pg. 294).

Indeed, society cannot exist in a moral vacuum. But we see no reason to allow "sexual orientation" legislation to impose a new, homosexually-invented brand of morality on our state.

"Denying Rights to Some Threatens All" Argument

A frequent argument in favor of homosexual rights is this:

"If we deny rights to any sort of people, we threaten the rights of all."

Brief analysis lays bare this statement's absurdity. Denying a murderer the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness in no way threatens the rights of law-abiding persons -- even a condemned murderer's closest relatives, so long as they're innocent of his crime.

Plainly, if society jails murderers, it won't also imprison people for **not** murdering.

If we hold that every person's rights are threatened every time a wrongdoer is punished, we'll have to give up fighting crime altogether!

"Right to Privacy" Argument

Some argue that homosexuals' "right to privacy" should override the public health and safety considerations we've raised.

Again, the Supreme Court in "Bowers vs. Hardwick" refused to grant homosexual behavior an absolute "right to privacy."

And, problematically, many homosexuals don't practice their behavior in private. Homosexuals are widely known to engage in sex acts (often with anonymous partners) in public parks, public rest rooms and bars, bathhouses and other establishments open to public patronage.

No one compels homosexuals to perform sexual acts in public places. Yet their behavior can easily become an intrusion on the privacy, as well as the health and safety, of others.

For example, on August 3, 1989, the Laguna Beach News Post reported City Council there refused to take action on the complaint of outraged citizens who appeared in support of a distraught mother. Her son had been frightened by three homosexual men engaged in sex in a public rest room.

City Council stated that such behavior was "protected" under the city's pro-"sexual orientation" ordinance.

Never before the largely-homosexually-spread AIDS epidemic has society considered privacy a factor when dealing with transmitters of highly communicable diseases -- even when those diseases are curable. Never before AIDS have carriers of an **incurable** disease been granted absolute rights to privacy, plus special legal protection and privileges.

Some argue that to deny homosexuals the right to publicly exhibit what they call their affection is to hinder the full expression "of our society's rich diversity." Must Colorado's citizens be forced to endure as "diversity" what most conscientiously consider perversity? We think not.

"Sympathy" Argument

At root, homosexuals and their supporters offer little argument other than a blatant appeal to sympathy -- often citing verbal or physical abuse of homosexuals as justification for being recognized as a protected class.

They hope by arousing sympathy to (as "The Overhauling of Straight America," p.8) puts it:

". . . be cast as victims in need of protection so that

straights will be inclined by reflex to assume the role of protector."

They hope, by thus manipulating the consciences of truly compassionate people, to gain the reward of special status.

Their argument boils down to this:

Homosexuals have suffered emotional torment and physical consequences **because society disapproves of their behavior.** Therefore, society should grant them ethnic status -- to redress their injuries and make them feel better.

First, homosexuals have never been able to demonstrate a convincing pattern of discrimination causing significant socioeconomic injury. Homosexuals themselves boast that they are affluent, prevalent and thriving in all areas of society.

When homosexual author James Spada, in The Spada Report, a survey of homosexual attitudes and behavior (New American Library, 1979), asked homosexual subjects "Have you ever had your rights denied you because you are gay?" -- 72.1% of his respondents answered "No" and an additional 10% gave no answer or said they "didn't know."

(Incidentally, during the three-year period including 1988-1990, the Colorado Springs Human Relations Division recorded a total of two complaints related to either sexual discrimination or ethnic harassment -- neither related to homosexuality.)

Secondly, injured feelings per se offer no compelling reason to bestow ethnic status and privilege. Should all incarcerated criminals serving sentences for bad behavior be released and given protected status simply because they're unhappy behind bars?

From the mere fact that someone has a grievance, it doesn't automatically follow that the aggrieved party is in the right or deserves redress.

Society is often right to be the agent of grief to dangerous and anti-social people.

In fact, 24 of the United States not only don't reward homosexual behavior with protected status, they place its practice under penalty of law.

In the final analysis, homosexuals are forced to resort to these specious arguments **because they in fact have no defensible rationale by which to claim protected status for their sexual behavior.**

As blatant fallacies, their arguments deserve no credence or place in rational discussion.

Hope for Homosexuals

We sincerely regret having had to recite this litany of unpleasant and embarassing facts, arguments and concerns. But the issues we've raised simply cannot be dismissed as symptoms of so-called "homophobia," "homohatred" or "bigotry."

Calling names cannot establish -- or discredit -- truth. The Greek roots of the word homophobia mean "fear of men." We who oppose granting ethnic status on grounds of "sexual orientation" don't fear men, we are concerned about the effects of homosexual behavior on society.

Why should we fear people whose preoccupation with the sole attribute of sexual behavior is so obsessive that it drives them to argue only on irrational grounds?

How can we hate people whose identity is so fragile, and so totally defined by sexuality, that they are obviously terrified at what they imagine to be the slightest threat to its unbridled expression?

Attributing negative characteristics to others **without proof** is the essence of bigotry. On which side of this issue does the real bigotry lie?

What accounts for homosexuals' personal misery? Can their unhappiness be wholly blamed on a "repressive" straight society? Blaming others only for one's woes is characteristic of classic psychological denial. And supposed repression by straight society in no way satisfactorily explains the persistent misery of homosexuals. Not when society era has, in our era, been so enormously tolerant of their behavior.

Homosexuals must accept responsibility for their own restless and destructive behavior -- and accept its consequences. Whether homosexuals like it or not, sharing personal responsibility is the price all must pay who wish to exercise personal freedom in our society.

Homosexual Behavior a Misguided Attempt to Love

Ironically, we believe homosexual behavior has essentially nothing to do with freedom -- or even with sexuality. We believe homosexual practices are misguided efforts to fill love needs not provided for in early childhood by same-gender parents.

Homosexual behavior is, as ex-homosexual clergyman and counselor Colin Cook puts it, "a psychic solution to a real

problem, but a false solution."

Homosexual behavior is what the Bible calls "sin" because sin defines any attempt to solve human problems or meet human needs without regard to God's solution as found in infallible Scripture and in His saving grace and mercy.

People ask us, "Do you believe homosexual behavior can be chosen?" We do. In fact, the weight of available psychiatric evidence rests solidly on the side of homosexuality's being an acquired and chosen behavior pattern.

As but one example, studies of prison inmate behavior clearly indicate that behind bars, many a man's strong sex drive, coupled with intense longing for a semblance of human intimacy, leads him to choose to practice homosexual behavior. The same studies show that such men most often revert quickly to heterosexuality once back outside the walls.

Extending a Restraining, Yet Hopeful Hand

Because homosexual behavior is a choice, we will oppose granting homosexuals ethnic status firmly, but gently. We sincerely hope and pray that many homosexuals, bisexuals and lesbians may be persuaded to reflect deeply on their behavior. To stop justifying it. And to forsake it. We have evidence, in living fact, that many homosexuals have done so.

And we would ask every homosexual to consider a question asked by the great prophet, Isaiah:

"Why are you striving for that which doesn't satisfy?"
Isaiah 55:2

Does homosexuality meet that universal need for deep and lasting love that burns inside us all? Homosexuals' extraordinarily fervid promiscuity argues an eloquent "no!"

But thousands of homosexuals **have** found rest from their desperate promiscuity and its temporarily gratifying indulgence. They have stopped striving to find love in ways that don't truly satisfy or endure.

They have found love that **does** satisfy -- in the life-changing grace of God. In fulfilling, other-centered, truly liberated, peaceable lives, happy marriages and biological parenthood.

The road to release from homosexual behavior is not an easy one. But escape **can be found** from the false "freedom" of homosexual behavior and other forms of sexual addiction. Many of us are living proof that sexual addiction can be conquered

through the power of God.

That is why the deepest purpose of Colorado for Family Values is to extend a hand of hope to homosexuals. We offer to introduce homosexuals to friends who can tell them more about this hope, and encourage them, every step of the way, to walk in true freedom.

To all who reach out for that hopeful hand, we'll be more than glad to extend a helpful hand in return.